



# FOOD/BEVERAGE CONCESSION CONSULTING SERVICE – REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

## ADDENDUM #2

**April 19, 2017**

- The following questions have been asked:

QUESTION	PORT'S ANSWER/RESPONSE
<p>Are we required to use the format of the Proposal Worksheet in the RFP or can we use another format to present our budget for the project? If we're required to use the format of the Proposal Worksheet, is the last column intended to be labeled Totals?</p>	<p>As noted in red/brackets on the Proposal Worksheet (Attachment 4): “[this is a placeholder sample of a way to have them present rates and potential total cost]”; therefore, proposers do <b>not</b> need to use this exact type of matrix/format. If this matrix/format is used, then “yes”, the last column should be headed as “Totals”.</p>
<p>Will the entire projected time line provided in Section II of the RFP (page 3 of 11) be adjusted given that there will be approximately 60 days between the date proposals are due in response to this RFP and the deadline for completing Tasks 1, 2, and 3 of the scope of services?</p>	<p>The Port recognizes that the time line for completing Tasks 1, 2, and 3 by June 30, 2017 is very short; however, we do not anticipate extending this time frame. We are under extreme pressure to have the 2018 Food/Beverage Concession Opportunities RFP out by the end of Summer 2018, so we are expecting the consultant to expedite completion of Tasks 1, 2, and 3. Proposers are free to “suggest” alternative time frames and/or compensation rates to address this required time frame. As information, Port staff expects to quickly review all consultant proposals and award the contract as quickly as possible.</p>
<p>Can proposers submit more than one hourly rate in the Proposal Worksheet for the staff to be assigned?</p>	<p>As noted in the response to the first question on this Addendum #2, the Proposal Worksheet (Attachment 4) is meant to be a sample matrix/format. If proposer has a more efficient, clear way of presenting its proposal, including providing more than one hourly rate for its services,</p>



	then proposers are free to use an alternative format.
Regarding Attachment 5-B, #3: Does this question only pertain to local participation in the Oakland area or could we answer this regarding community participation in other locations?	The question pertains to the Port's local impact area ("LIA"), that is, within Alameda and Contra Costa counties. We will also consider responses in other locations as well.
Will the future food/beverage concessions be limited to the existing spaces or will there be an opportunity to identify additional locations and/or reconfigure the existing locations?	For the 2018 Food/Beverage Concession Opportunities RFP, the Port expects just minimal changes to existing spaces; e.g., locations without grease intercepts or hood/venting should not expect those type of infrastructure improvements. Conversely, there are two multi-concept spaces (i.e., "food courts") in Terminal 2 that we could expect to be redeveloped with an alternative layout. Both Terminals 1 and 2 are older structures with little expansion opportunities in the near term.
Does the Port have as-built drawings for the existing concession that can be provided to the consultant?	The successful proposer will have access to whatever as-built drawings the Port has available in its records.

2. In combination with Addendum #1, this represents the total questions received by the Port by the Question/Request for Information Due Date of April 17, 2017 (see Introduction: Page 2 of 3).